

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 17 and 18 are new. In an Office Action dated January 6, 2004, the Examiner objected to a typographical error in Claim 1 and rejected Claims 1-16 under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory double patenting. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the error -- addressing the objection. A terminal disclaimer accompanies this response -- addressing the rejection.

Newly added Claim 17 includes limitations similar to those found in Claim 1, while newly added Claim 18 includes limitations similar to those found in Claim 10. Consequently, the new claims do not add new matter.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Steve O. Rasmussen, et. al

By



Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685